

... the art of photoanalysis

By Jack White

My training since 1950 has been in working with photos and photography, as art director, designer, photographer and director for major advertising projects, in the studio as well as the darkroom. I am a trained observer who sees details the layman will not notice. Since 1963 I have put my observational skills to work as an analyst of photographs, which I describe as more an art than a science.



The bulk of my photo studies has dealt with allegations of malfeasance by the US government in three major cases: the assassination of President Kennedy, the alleged trips to the moon by the Apollo missions, and the alleged hijackings which caused the tragedies of September 11. Unlike many cases, these three have abundant images to study. More than 40 years of study has convinced me:

- 1. Never accept "official stories" without close questioning.**
- 2. Never never accept "official photos" without close examination.**
- 3. The government has excellent capabilities for faking photos.**
- 4. Many who are assigned to fake photos against their conscience put secret clues in their work in the hope the fakery will be exposed.**

The photoanalyst must search tiny details for these often subtle clues left by the "whistleblowers". In the JFK case, I found shoes the wrong color which help prove the famed Zapruder film a hoax, a misplaced rifle sling ring showing the LHO rifle was not used in the shooting, and that CE399, the "magic bullet," was initially a 6-groove bullet which was later switched to a 4-groove missile.



In the Apollo case, some color photos left on a LEM landing pad posed a question which NASA refused to answer. A piece of black paper nailed over part of a decal was another image which cannot be explained by the official record.



On the following pages are some of my studies of the events of 9-11-01. I think they prove conclusively that some of the "official photos" are reconstructions, composites, retouched, or otherwise faked. One must then ask: If 19 arabs were responsible, why did the Pentagon fake photos?



In the beginning...

...4 giant jetliners crashed and exploded



New York



Washington




Pennsylvania

Copyright Val McClatchey 2001

**But the instant
of impact varied
dramatically !**

Fully loaded with thousands of gallons of jet fuel, four giant Boeing airliners are alleged to have crashed at three different sites, creating gigantic explosions and fires. An unknown photographer snapped the photo at top of the second crash at the World Trade Center. Within seconds of impact, the photo at left was snapped of the explosion and fire at the Pentagon by motorist Steve Riskus. Within seconds of the explosion in rural Pennsylvania, Val McClatchey shot the photo at right. Do these three photos contradict the official story?



1. Man in blue shirt and suspenders holding IV bag. I call him "bagman".

2. Two green beret photographers, plus one shooting the photo.

3. The praying priest.

4. Sitting women.

5. Medical man in white.

6. Red stretcher.

7. Ambulance gurney.

8. Grass/color of grass.

9. Smoke.

10. Red truck.

11. Sidewalk.

12. Short post beside sidewalk.

13. Firetrucks.

14. Tree.

15. Spectators.

16. Injured persons.

17. Distance of triage

area away from the

Pentagon building.

18. Time of day.

19. Heliport landing

20. Jugs of water.

21. Warning sign.

22. Police car.

23. Distant buildings.

24. Steel guard rails.

24. Steel guard rails,
and more to come.

...AND MORE TO COME.

—

continued next page





These three photos all exhibit a retouched area of greener grass beside the sidewalk but no steel guardrail which was there.



Two young Catholic priests, Francis DeRosa and Steven McGraw, arrived at the triage scene to give comfort and last rites, and stayed till 5:30 pm.



The green strip of grass will be discussed on the next page.

continued next page



All the trauma photos have a strip of greener grass east of the sidewalk.

Why is this strange ?

This is most peculiar, because aerial photos of the area show that alongside the east edge of that sidewalk is a steel guardrail, as seen below. The guardrail has been retouched out of the photos, OR these photos are computer composites taken at a different time!



This aerial taken a few days later shows the triage area (A) and the sidewalk (B). The green arrows point to a steel guardrail along the east edge of the sidewalk; the guardrail is seen in other photos, but not the trauma photos. Since the steel rail is not seen, the trauma photos cannot be genuine.

continued next page



The water jugs show where the young lady is sitting. But she cannot sit there because we have shown that...



...there's a steel guardrail there!

A smiling Green Beret comforts a barely injured mini-skirted young lady (note the kerchief tied around her knee) amidst the chaos of the Pentagon disaster.



...and why such a bad triage area ?

Except for the "photo-op" background of the burning Pentagon, nobody in their right mind would choose the little grass strip (X) as a location to carry badly injured persons and lay them on the ground for triage treatment. It was about 100 yards from the building, and on the side that was burning. It was bounded on the street side by a steel guardrail and on the grass side by another steel guardrail, so was virtually inaccessible. Four sides of the five-sided building were accessible to ambulances by streets or service roads; the attacked side was not. Photos show that dozens of ambulances responded to the explosion; ambulance paramedics should have loaded and treated the injured at the four undamaged sides...not at a spot a hundred yards away hemmed in by steel guardrails limiting access by ambulances. These are someone's idea of public relations photos, complete with pretty girl leg art (at top).

continued next page

The Catholic Herald named two young priests who by chance were stuck in nearby traffic, and grabbed their purple "portable stoles" and holy oil to assist with last rites and prayer. Government photographer Mark Faram took these two photos, but did not get the names of the priests, so we must assume that these are Steve McGraw and Francis DeRosa.



Father McGraw, 36, was a Justice Department attorney for many years before becoming a Catholic priest shortly before 9-11. If genuine priests conveniently were on the scene for photos as reported later...

...why do the trauma photos appear to be PhotoShopped?



Coming on next page, a SIGN of fakery.

continued next page



In the top photo we see a yellow and black sign warning of the helicopters which land on the landing pad beyond the police car. In the faked trauma photo at bottom we see the police car and sign, but no trace of the dark pole beside it which has a large silver electrical box attached. Lazy fakery or maybe a whistleblower?

What is missing here ?

continued next page



Detailed study of the faked trauma photos reveals puzzling anomalies. Three of the photos show a red SUV or station wagon. The bagman has moved a little closer to the two sitting women and is treating a different "patient"but the red car has changed to BEHIND him from far in front of him with little change in camera position. A lime green firetruck is prominent in one photo, but virtually unseen in the others. But **MOST CURIOUS** is the **RED AND WHITE DEVICE** in front of the green firetruck. I call it a **WHATSIT**, because it matches no known equipment present that day. At first glance it resembles a red and white firetruck, but it is much too small, has no wheels, and two oddly placed windows. A peculiar white pipe runs from its top to the ground. It has a large number 01 on it. In the foreground is an object alleged to be a piece of an American Airlines plane. But the "wreckage" in the bagman photo is viewed looking **SOUTH**, and the photo of the "wreckage" beside it is taken looking **EAST**...yet they match in viewpoint. What's going on?

continued next page

Mystery explosion of Building 6 update



Update: new CBS video shows exact timing of explosion



New York researcher Stephen St. John in April found this brief CBS video clip which shows the beginning of the dust cloud from the WTC6 explosion as it begins to move down Vesey St. It occurs at the same moment that the second plane impacts (yellow square). The CNN frame is one minute AFTER the impact, so the CBS video is one minute earlier. Unfortunately, the video catches only a small part of the cloud in the lower right corner (red circle) as it begins, but it is enough to be unmistakable, and in the right place.

Mystery explosion of Building 6



Timing and location of explosion shown

Search of thousands of photos yielded the one at upper right, taken from Hudson river level, that virtually matches the CNN helicopter view that was shot from a higher angle. Comparison shows that BOTH towers are still standing at the time of the mystery explosion, so the CNN rising dust cloud cannot be related to either tower collapsing, and the cloud is clearly separated away from the base of the north tower. The cloud is not seen in the Hudson River photo, when only the WTC1 has been hit, and is seen in the CNN frame only after WTC2 has been hit BUT BEFORE IT COLLAPSES. Indeed, the CNN FCC log shows the explosion ONE MINUTE after the second building was hit. On the computer enhanced image at bottom, the CNN frame is overlaid in position, showing that it is at Vesey Street, which separates WTC7 and WTC6, and far away from the twin towers. Who would notice a ground explosion with the building tops afire?



CNN frame overlaid

Enhancement shows two separate buildings

Problems for the DoD !

Early press and internet called the trailer the "construction office" for the Pentagon renovation work. This is common practice in the building industry. Indeed, the stairs to the floor level of the trailer are also common, because the floor is about four feet above ground. This is because the front of the trailer is supported by fold-up legs called "landing gear" (see photo).

PROBLEM 1

What happened to the landing gear of the trailer? How could a plane which struck the Pentagon 75 feet away cause the trailer landing gear to collapse? These are sturdy steel pipes that are designed to support thousands of pounds of payload.



PROBLEM 2

Does the above image represent the bottom half of the front of the trailer with the top half missing? Or is it a dumpster with burning material inside? If part of trailer, it makes the trailer much too long (see discussion of axle and suspension).



PROBLEM 3

The Riskus image "locks-in" the "stairway to nowhere" seen above. But there is no door at the top of the burned-out landing, since the front of the trailer has been exploded. So the defense department is stuck with a temporary wooden staircase for all photos.




PROBLEM 4

Clearly the Riskus image shows a SINGLE-AXLE suspension system and wheels (1 axle, 4 wheels). Construction office trailers, which carry no heavy load, typically have single-axle rear wheel assemblies. This is a big DoD problem!

continued next page

Problems for the DoD ! No problem !

PhotoShop and PROPAGANDA can solve any problem at the Pentagon. After a considerable time, the disinformation specialists came up with "answers" to the problems and began posting "new photos" of "the trailer" on the internet. Why... that trailer was not a "construction office" at all. It was a special ELECTRICAL TRAILER to GENERATE ELECTRICITY for the renovation work. And even though the plane impacted 75 feet away from the trailer, "the ENGINE NACELLE and WING TIP of the airplane hit the top of the trailer and set it afire"...and they supplied numerous Department of Defense photos as "proof". But proof of what?



Above is an artist rendering of the alleged "generator" trailer. Notice it has a door (A) where the wooden stairs led. It has ventilating louvers (B) on side and rear. It has a door (C) and it has a TANDEM axle assembly (D).



Above is a badly botched PhotoShop tampering of the "generator". The wooden stairs have been reduced to two strips of stringers without steps. The front of the "trailer" not only has no door, it fakes in a shape with stripes which was not there.



At left is another poorly done PhotoShop illustration. Compare it with the one above and note differences such as X. In the picture at top, notice the GASH (G) which the DoD claims was gouged in the roof by the wing of the 757 as it flew over. The problem is that the direction of the gouge is not in the direction of the impact with the Pentagon. What is going on here?



I guess this pretty much demolishes the "wing tip gouge theory," doesn't it?

PhotoShopping fails again!

continued next page

Locating the explosion at street level 2



Gaping hole in Vesey Street face of Building 6 before either tower fell.

Building 6 was at the corner of Vesey and West (traffic lights) between Building 7 and the North Tower. This recently discovered photo shows firemen responding to an explosion and fire in Building 6 before either tower fell. How do we know that? Both towers created huge clouds of dust when they came down; the North Tower was adjacent to Building 6, and the South Tower was a block away. There is NO DUST in the street by the ambulance, so NEITHER TOWER HAS FALLEN, yet Building 6 is shown to have already exploded, and firemen are spraying water on it. Spectators stand in the intersection of West and Vesey, which they could not have done if either tower had fallen. According to the official story, Building 6 was damaged by falling debris from the North Tower. But this photo shows the massive damage to the building BEFORE the North Tower collapsed, giving lie to the official story. It also shows a huge hole on the side of the building facing away from the source of any debris.

trailer, trailer, burning bright



How many axles?

Riskus (far right) shows a single axle.

The "generator trailer" art shows a tandem axle, which is standard on most large heavy vans.

The photo at top shows a TRI-TANDEM axle assembly, used on only for extremely heavyweight trailers. It has 3 axles and 12 wheels. A "construction trailer" would be very light and only require a single axle. The federal government regulates the weight-length-axle ratio of all trailers. The top photo is also very peculiar in that it shows a "bend" in the middle of the trailer, unlike Riskus, which shows the area blasted outward. The top photo also has good view of the stairway to nowhere. Note the "gash."




continued next page

more failed computer images for your amusement



I think it is certain that some, many or all of these images have been created or altered by computer. Why?



In order to understand the following studies, one must be familiar with the areas north and east of the Pentagon, and such O.C. landmarks as the Washington Monument (yellow dot) and the U.S. Capitol dome (red dot). Perhaps all of the photographs are perfectly genuine; but perhaps someone took artistic license with some of them for reasons unknown.



Benign, or propaganda?

The photos at left from almost the same viewpoint seem mutually exclusive. Benign artistry, or for patriotic effect?

continued next page





1. Small dome to left, side lighted.
2. Large dome, same place, but note added tree. Crane same size.
3. Monument at left instead of capitol dome.
4. Suburb to left, no monument or dome seen.
5. Suburb to left, but monument to the right!

Can all these be accurate photos?



Where was the Washington Monument on 9-11?



uh, Mr Rumsfeld, sir we're up here on the hill
trying to shoot photos. sir but some damn
fool keeps moving the Washington Monument.

Like a party crasher who makes his way
into the background of every photo, the
Washington Monument kept moving left,
right, and center.


continued next page

As the sun sets in the EAST on 9-11, backgrounds go awry.

The photo below was captioned "Pentagon at Sunset"...but photo looks northeast, not west! Note the lighting on the side of the dome. An obvious PhotoShop composite!

Photos A and B at right look same general direction (green lines and green dots), but the two photos have views of two totally different backgrounds...an impossibility?

Did someone order a "patriotic" look to all possible photos?





Capitol dome and Washington Monument added for PATRIOTIC impact!



Analysis of the bagman photo (upper right) has shown retouched grass strip as well as two curious anomalies (whatsits)...a "red firetruck" and "wreckage" from AA77. Most researchers agree that the "wreckage" was planted or inserted into photos at a later time than 9-11. As for the firetruck...there WAS a truck there at one time (above middle), but not for the faked bagman photo. I believe that the bagman photo was composited and altered on a computer, and the two objects CRUDELY added. A red/white shape was created to resemble the firetruck, but in a very jumbled configuration, with firemen that are too large, one odd back wheel, no front wheels, and number changed from 61 to 01. As previously noted the "wreckage" view in both photos is the same, though the viewpoint has changed 90 degrees.

continued next page

Locating the explosion at street level




This map clearly shows that the view above looks south on West, past Vesey Street, to WTC6 and WTC1.

Telephone Building places blast at West and Vesey Streets...the location of WTC6, the 8-story Customs House!

The NBC frame above clearly shows a gigantic explosion blasting outward onto West Street from the Customs House...WTC Building 6. The smoke and dust cannot be coming from the North Tower in the background, or from the South Tower more than a block away which is blocked from West Street by WTC3, the Marriott Hotel. This ground level NBC frame (note logo at lower right) appears to definitely show the identical event seen in the the CNN frame shown previously, in the same location. Therefore, one minute after the second plane hit WTC2, while onlookers were distracted by the events at skyscraper levels, a massive blast tore apart WTC6...an explosion which could not have its origin from the events high above. Explosives in the building? Most likely!


After completing the previous two pages on the WHATSITS, I thought I should search all available Pentagon firetruck photos and look at all red firetrucks in an attempt to identify Whatsit #1. I found no such firetrucks, but after hours of searching, I did find another photo of both "whatsits", which is indeed interesting.



Fire Rescue truck 61 was the only truck in other photos that resembled the "whatsit" red and white object with the "01" number. In the bagman photo, it has two windows. In the new photo one window, but truck Number 61 has three.

In the bagman photo, the "whatsit 01" is near the rear of the green truck; in the new photo it is beyond the front. But note details A and B. The "AA77" wreckage appears very pixelated (rough) when enlarged, yet the distant "whatsit" is very smooth, perhaps indicating possible computer composite of two computer images of different dots-per-inch resolutions! Note the addition of the man on top spraying water.

continued next page




**the long and
short of it**



Possibly the "model" for "whatsits" A and B was the photo above (shown to be faked in a later study), showing engine 61 parked by the rear of one of the National Airport green trucks. Something is very suspicious about the two photos at left. Upper view is very LONG and stretched out. Lower view, although from directly side-on, appears to be very SHORT, just the opposite of what perspective dictates.





Top photo shows the firetrucks north of the landing pad beside the heliport building. Next photo looks opposite direction at trucks on south side of landing pad. Comparison at left shows views of A and B shows clear differences of "rear" of the red "whatsit" truck, with differing "windows".

continued next page



In another photo the Navy doctor has blood all over his white shirt. Of course it could be argued that the bloody shirt was a LATER photo.

In the faked trauma photo above (excerpt at left), it appears that several unseen persons are hidden behind the three people in the foreground. Parts of people can be seen as noted at left: (A) thigh of person seated on the grass; (B) lower leg and shoe of that same seated person; (C) sock and partial shoe of same person, but leg is not seen and the shoe goes under sidewalk; (D) portion of torso of some person standing in the background; (E) red hair of some person standing in the background. If a person is sitting on the grass, it seems unlikely that he could be hidden entirely behind the doctor; some portion of his body or arms should be in the retouched grass area to the left of the doctor...and certainly his shoe could not go underneath the sidewalk. This is an obvious mistake by the person who faked the photo. Or was this a subtle clue purposely left by a patriotic whistleblower?

continued next page



DoD chief Rumsfeld (left) walked just a few feet away from the trauma scene at the same time of day. He missed a great photo opportunity by not having a publicity picture made with the victims and heroic triage workers. Or were they even there?




continued next page



One thing is certain: a sidewalk circled the west side of the Pentagon, as seen in the satellite photo taken before 9-11. But many photos of the sidewalk area such as the two at right raise doubts of photo authenticity. The white lines that mark buildings in distance indicate a similar line of sight. The red auto shows the trauma scene to be slightly farther south. But the aerial shows grass ends at triage site, so bottom photo is necessarily faked. Both lack the guardrail east of the sidewalk. More detail follows, showing various anomalies in the sidewalk and guardrails.



continued next page



The mystery of the sidewalk and guardrails

Photos taken before, during and after 9-11 showing the sidewalk area are very curious. Some, like the Riskus excerpt at left, show NO SIDEWALK, but a guardrail. Some show NO GUARDRAIL but show the sidewalk. Some show BOTH the sidewalk and guardrail. I will examine these on the next page.

[continued next page](#)

**Odd photo shows TWO steel guardrails,
NO sidewalk, and jacked-up car in between.**



This photo seems to have a genuine background (before the wall collapse), but a fabricated foreground. It shows TWO guardrails with a police car in between them. Note the hood of the car (A) clearly is between two rails, and the rear of the car (B) is about TWO FEET HIGHER than rail at A and C. Even more odd is the streetlight pole (D) allegedly knocked down by the incoming jetliner. It balances precariously ON TOP OF THE INNER GUARDRAIL! A jacked up car and balancing pole could well be the work of an anonymous whistleblower who faked the photo.



These two photos have a common point of reference (E) but other differences. At left, the pole (D) floats in air in a different location, with a sidewalk behind it. In front, it has an unblemished NEW guardrail with a "curb" in front with debris, but grass instead of pavement. Do these two pictures show the same scene?

continued next page



Neither of these photos has the "stealth" sidewalk...but they do have interesting things the same as well as **DIFFERENT**. Note the numbers as follows:

1. Same window from same viewpoint; 2. Same firetruck from slightly different viewpoint; 3. Same point of reference with things sticking up; 4. Same cable reel; 5. Same small stick with sign, **BUT** at top it is **UPRIGHT** and **BEHIND** the rail, and at bottom it **LEANS** and is **IN FRONT OF** rail; 6 and 7. Two small devices on grass in widely divergent locations; 8. In top photo, smooth new rail with man standing in front of it, but at bottom, a rail with three bent places with car in front of it; and 9. Rusted and battered rail, not seen in top photo, only in bottom photo. In my opinion the backgrounds of these photos are genuine, but the foregrounds have been added using computer technology to make them look different.



At left is another example of the two guardrails, one on each side of the sidewalk. A fireman stands on the sidewalk between the rails (red spots) watching two cars burn next to the building. The cars are at upper left in top photo.

continued next page



A sidewalk encircled the heliport area. A steel rail separated it from the heliport lawn. Photos which show neither are suspect.



The photo at left shows a sidewalk, but no rail on the heliport side, only on the street side. Some photos show two guardrails, some show none. Some show a sidewalk, some show none. Unless there is some other explanation, a guardrail should separate the heliport lawn from the sidewalk.

continued next page



**The
missing
sidewalk
and other
really bad
PhotoShop®
fakery.**



The photo at top is so poorly fabricated that I will need another page to point out all the things wrong with it by comparison with other photos shown above (this does not mean the other photos are genuine, just different). See next page.

continued next page

...the stealth sidewalk!

Stealth 5b



The missing sidewalk

Both photos have the red truck and the planted plane debris. But the photo at left has a guardrail, and no sidewalk. The photo at right has a sidewalk and no guardrail.



The botched guardrail

Besides being in the wrong place, the rail has the wrong configuration and no bolts.



The white thing in the window, the tree, and the red firetruck


At left and middle, the window and tree are north of the firetruck. At right they are south of the truck. Below, they are very far south of the truck.



Too high!

Based on the size of the guardrail compared to the size of the vehicle, the rail and the vehicle appear to be very close together. The proper perspective in my opinion should look like the corrected version to keep the vehicle from floating in air, much too large. There are other anomalies in the photo on the previous page if you want to search for them.

continued next page



These two photos show the same area on the west side of the Pentagon, slightly northwest of the heliport. The aerial at right shows a guardrail (red dot) between the sidewalk and the heliport lawn; the one above does not. The aerial shows white traffic stripes (yellow line) beside the curb; the one above does not. The aerial shows no guardrail beside the curb at this entry ramp from the Pentagon in this short stretch, but the one above has a rail there (green dot). I can only conclude that the photo above is a composite or fabrication of some sort.



The photo at left sums it up: the fireman stands on an unseen sidewalk between two steel guardrails; the one in front of him separates the heliport lawn from the walk. The one behind him separates the walk from the freeway. The fireman looks at two burning cars...

...the mysterious burning cars !





The photo at left used to introduce this section is likely a fake also. The heliport is on a very FLAT area on the west side of the building. The fireman is looking DOWN on the cars (blue dots), with his head at the second floor level. There is no such vantage point.



The heliport landing pad and lawn were on a very flat area, and the cars (orange oval) were at the same level. The guard rail next to the sidewalk is at same level.



The two cars were the subject of some of the earliest photos released, such as one at left. Note that the white Nissan 2-door sedan seems to be missing its hood with the motor on fire. Beyond, a dark green SUV seems undamaged although closer to the impact point. It is not on fire. But wait! In the photo above, taken at a later time, the car is black instead of white, and the SUV is white, not green!



at first the
SUV was
dark green
and the
Nissan was
white.

Earliest photos include the two at top. The Riskus photo at top was taken about one minute after the explosion, and the second a few minutes later. The green SUV was undamaged, though the impact point (red dot) was about 20 feet away. The wing span of a 757 is 125 feet, yet the cars were not hit and no wing debris is seen. In the bottom two photos the SUV distance from the impact point is seen after the wall collapse. The white license plate of the SUV is clearly seen in contrast to the dark color of the paint. The fire has been out for at least 30 minutes at bottom.



**While the
car was
still white...**



**...the tree had
its ups, downs
and ups.**



In the two top photos the Nissan is still white (yellow dot) although the SUV also has turned white. Firetruck 345 from National Airport is still spraying water in the second photo. The tree beyond the firetruck, though devoid of leaves, is standing tall (green dot), but in the top photo is seen lying on the ground between the car and the building. At bottom a photo taken many days later shows the tree erect again. I believe that the top two photos were not shot on 9-11, but on a later day using different or moved props.

continued next page

Are the two vehicles the same ?



This image was taken by motorist Steve Riskus within the first minute of the Pentagon explosion. It shows a white Nissan 2-door car at left, and a much taller dark green SUV at right, with a white license plate. Neither vehicle is on fire at this point.



Department of Defense photo No. 11, taken at a later unknown time, shows that the white car has turned to black and the dark green SUV has changed to white, with no license plate, and is considerably shorter in height. My opinion...vehicles are not the same!



Adding to the confusion is the fact that at some point, both cars were set afire, and the firemen sprayed foam on them...but clearly the foam did not change the dark green color of the SUV or its license plate.



The curious car fire

Earliest photos (top) show the motor of the Nissan blazing and right side car paint still white. The SUV seems unharmed. Later (next photo), the motor fire dies down as 3 men walk up, and the white paint is still unaffected by fire. Much later (possibly next day, upper right) both cars are badly burned **ALTHOUGH ALL FIRES HAD BEEN PUT OUT EARLIER!** Detail (right) shows the hood still in place, so how did the motor fire burn so long under the hood, when it should have been easily extinguished?

giant can opener used on car hood!



Initial photo above was the only closeup showing where the fire was seen, with hood relatively intact. In 2005, the photo below appeared on the internet, showing giant gash across the hood, with edges inward, inflicted by an unknown downward chop.





The Nissan motor fire burned for hours, raising a question of why it burned so long without being extinguished. This photo raises another question: What falling object (?) created the downward force (yellow arrow) that slashed a precise 1'x4' gash across the hood? If an aircraft part, why was it not produced as proof? Why did the car catch fire when this gash was the only apparent damage in early photos? Was this a prop planted in advance to assure a fire when the explosion occurred?



The white-clad Pentagon photographer above apparently is shooting the photo seen at right. The flame is clearly coming from the gash...but keep in mind that fire in a car motor has little to feed it, since the gas tank is in the rear, so why did it burn so long? Remember also that a gas fire burns with black sooty smoke, not seen in any photos of the car fire.






The fires were all out (next day?), even the Nissan motor fire. It suddenly appears that someone has splashed fuel on the green SUV to rekindle a fire there. The green SUV turns white, and the white Nissan has turned black. The SUV now has no license plate. What caused this fire at such a later time after other fires were extinguished?



All fires are out at both cars. The gash on the hood of the blackened white Nissan is seen. The green SUV has turned white all over, even where untouched by fire.



A large piece of debris not present in early photos has been added



Debris is added
... and added
... and added
... and added



From no debris beside the SUV initially, in subsequent photo setups they kept adding and adding more and more debris till it got ridiculous. Some of it may have been computer aided by a PhotoShop artist (see next page).

continued next page

Tiny SUV, huge background!



The image at right is plainly a PhotoShop image, in which the building has been made twice actual size, as at left. Note that green car and white car are same size and photographed at same angle, but background has become larger and moved upward and to the right. Cannot be genuine!



The red firetruck and the SUV are known to be on the same level, so their wheels should line up (orange line) when the small photo is overlaid over the large photo, but the SUV is about 5 feet too low. The SUV, parked at a right angle to wall, should share the same vanishing point as the building, but goes wildly into the air (green line). This is either grossly incompetent PhotoShopping...or whistleblowing by a conscientious objector.




To understand the crimes of 911, you must know the crime scene. A Boeing 757 with a wingspan of 125 feet is said to have impacted the Pentagon as shown above. Seventeen sets of windows covering about 100+ feet are between the collapse point and the heliport. For comparison, a silhouette of a 757 is shown at near scale.

It seems elementary that the wings would extend at least 60 feet on each side of the alleged impact point. Since the two cars previously shown were about 30+ feet from the impact point, they should have been struck by the plane's left wing and demolished, since the alleged point of impact was at ground level. (If the exact dimensions of windows were known, distances could be calculated instead of estimated; my estimates may not be precise, but should be close enough for comparison purposes.)



continued on next page



D = door
N = Nissan car
FT = firetruck



Most photos show the two burning cars parked adjacent to windows 14 and 15 (red diagonals at top), and the red firetruck backed up to window 5. However, many of the later photos show that the cars and firetruck were moved around in an elaborate shell game. The bottom photo (enlarged at left) shows the Nissan **TURNED** slightly and moved much closer to the blazing SUV and next to windows 11 and 12 (compare to second photo). The car is now only one window away from the tree next to the door. Differing perspective cannot account for such moves. The cars were **MOVED**, either actually, or by computer. Note the location of the piece of metal (red dot).

Earlier comparisons show that the shell game started with the switch of SUVs...a white one replacing a taller green one. Also I think the window is not the same shape, the white license plate is gone, and the back bumper is different.

[continued next page](#)




you see it...now you don't !

At left the two burning cars are seen in front of windows 14 and 15. Above, allegedly the same day, flames still erupt from five Pentagon windows, but the Jeep and the sport car HAVE DISAPPEARED from their location in other photos. Judging from the light and shadows, the time of day appears to be before noon (sunlight on heliport building and firetrucks, but not on west wall of Pentagon), and based on other photos, the cars MUST be there!

continued next page



Above is the damaged red firetruck in its alleged location. Note its relation to the Heliport building and door (HD). Compare the location of the truck, building and door in the photo at right, taken from a freeway on a hillside. Whoever did the computer alterations got it all wrong. The Heliport door is much too narrow, in the wrong place, and to the rear of the firetruck. The space between the firetruck and the two cars has been compressed also. Checking our window chart, right, we see that the cars are at about windows 10 and 11, not at 14 and 15. Whistle-blowing, or just bad art?



Here are comparisons with fires at highest and after they are extinguished.




Mr. PhotoShopper really went overboard here, moving the red firetruck at left over snug against the smoking Nissan, as fires still rage and actors huddle. This amounts to a move of more than 40 feet, and cannot be due to camera angle.



Here (yellow arrow), the SUV is underground and the red firetruck is backed up to windows 10 and 11, not 4 and 5 as in some photos.

continued next page



The inset photo proves beyond any doubt that the firetruck is in the wrong place. The branch of the tree to the right of the door fits exactly, placing the red firetruck to the right of the door. Other photos show the vehicle far to the LEFT of the door.



Constant relocation of the red firetruck in virtually every photo is an obvious clue to fakery in most photos showing it. It is in six or more different places, judging by its proximity to windows, doors and trees. Note in the 5 photos above it is by tree, by door, by 3rd window, by 2nd window, and in front of door **SPRAYING WATER** although officially disabled by fire. Was the truck actually moved around between photos, or were images produced by computer graphics?

continued next page



If the preceding page was too complex to understand easily, these two photos show how far the firetruck was moved toward the tree.

continued next page

You too can learn to do photoanalysis. All you need is a good eye for detail and a good memory of what you have seen in other photos. I will spare you the memory part. I remembered these three pix had common points (red dots).



I made a photo mosaic using common points and numbered building windows with established numbers. I added lines connecting common points as seen at right.




What did you see wrong in the three photos, based on the studies which precede this? Answers: 1. top left photo has the red firetruck by window 11, not window 5; 2. bottom photo also shows Nissan next to window 11, instead of window 14 and SUV next to window 13, not window 15. SUV has same view in both top and bottom photos, yet backgrounds are **TOTALLY DIFFERENT**, an impossibility when taking photos. There are other anomalies too, if you look closely. Were these anomalies the result of actually moving the cars around on the crime scene, or the result of clever computer graphics. Maybe a little of both. But PhotoShop is easier.



Using methods explained on the previous page, I noticed that these two photos contain the **SAME REFERENCE** points taken from the same point of view, and I connected them with white lines. But when these background points are made the same scale, the SUV is different in size and is in a very different location. Photographically this is impossible because of the laws of perspective. I believe both of these images were computer generated.


[continued next page](#)



Green line
represents
alignment of
tree in the
photos.

The wandering firetruck.

1. Earliest photo shows the rear of truck on fire, next to heliport building.
 2. At end of fire, truck was in same location with rear end of truck and rear tire destroyed.
 3. Photo now shows truck by first window next to door.
 4. Now the truck is by the second window from the door.
 5. This picture shows the truck parked in front of the doorway to the main building, SPRAYING WATER, even though the rear of the truck was destroyed.
 6. The truck back in its original location.
- With its rear tires burned off (2) how did the truck move to all of these locations?



extinguishing
the fire



A photographer at the Navy annex complex on a nearby hill shot a series of interesting photos of the west side of the Pentagon, but unfortunately we have no dates nor sequences...

which makes a confusing story even more muddled. First, a giant American Airlines 757 airliner was alleged to have crashed at the point of the red spot, yet did absolutely no damage to the Pentagon lawn, and little damage to the building, and leaving no wreckage visible anywhere.




These two photos are very curious. The top one shows all fires out except for the Nissan and SUV. The red firetruck appears to be undamaged. The main fire has been extinguished by firetrucks from National Airport which have already left the scene (as I will explain next). Contrary to other photos, not a single PERSON is seen on the lawn. The bottom photo shows fires have now broken out on the third and fourth floors a great distance away, and the 2 National Airport firetrucks have RETURNED (at left) to spray water where the fire is out, ignoring the flames above.



distance between
front of SUV
and point of wall collapse

distance between
front of SUV
and point of wall collapse




The top photo seems to show the SUV much closer to the red firetruck than to the edge of the collapsed wall (center and right). There seem to be about 6 window spaces in the green area and at least 11 in the yellow area. The photo at right shows the SUV only about 4 window widths away from the collapse edge. This seems apparent without photogrammetric calculations.






**Was lamppole
downed by
jetliner or by
PhotoShop®?**




Top photo shows that lamppole #119 stood between two steel guard rails. Just a few feet away (orange lines) is an almost undamaged pole with broken base and ID number decal. If we could only make out the number, it might prove that the two poles are the same.



Officially, an incoming Boeing 757 knocked down five lamppoles as it came in to crash less than 20 feet above the grass. We are asked to believe that the pole was only damaged at the base and top, but otherwise was in pristine condition. White line matching two top photos (at middle kink in guardrail) shows the pole fell almost undamaged only about two car lengths from its original position.


continued next page



By lining up the windows A and B in these photos, we see that all are taken from about the same POV. This raises the question... should the lamp pole be seen at top and bottom?



Lining up the trailer wheel and cable reel in the background (white lines), the foregrounds are not consistent. The red line show an object in a different place.



From a common point of view west of the Pentagon, a DoD photographer allegedly took all of these photos (and others) at an unknown time. In my opinion the backgrounds are genuine, but the foregrounds have been added by computer image compositing. As I have previously shown, the top pic shows a single shiny new steel guardrail, and the next two show two guardrails, one of them rusted and dented. One photo has a lamppole between the guardrails and the other has a car at an odd angle between the two rails. At left and on the previous page, I have raised the question of whether the lamppole seen erect at left is the same one lying on the ground in the next photo. I also believe it is possible that the police car has been added between the rails. Coming next...the saga of the "uninvited firemen" and what some call the "Amazing Indestructible Pentalawn!"



continued next page



The firemen who crashed the party!


By literal "accident"
two uninvited firetrucks
showed up and created
a problem for the official
story...a pristine lawn!



continued next page




Uninvited firemen took this singlemost important photo of 9-11, exposing truth !



Two National Airport firetrucks by sheer "accident" were working a traffic collision less than a mile from the Pentagon when they heard an explosion a very short distance to the north. One of them took the photo at left. Fearing an explosion at the Pentagon, they took off at once in an emergency mode, arriving (top) in about ten minutes. They found two small fires that they put out in seven minutes. They saw NO SIGNS of an aircraft crashing there.

[continued next page](#)



The best laid schemes o' mice an' men Gang aft a-gley...

---Robert Burns

The Pentagon has ultra-heavy security. But with the building ablaze, who would dare deny entry to two quick arriving firetrucks...the first on the scene, even though they were uninvited? As previously mentioned, they were there within ten minutes, though some ambulances beat them (picture 3, left). When they arrived, there was lots of smoke, little fire. They drove onto the neat lawn, the heavy trucks leaving tracks in the **UNDAMAGED** grass (above enlarged from picture 4). According to the story told by the firemen, through a small hole (in front of the firetruck at left above), they could see fire inside the building. In front of the truck at right, a large trailer was afire, making most of the smoke. Spraying water (above) they extinguished both small fires within 7 minutes of arrival. They saw **NO WRECKAGE**, no bodies, no indication of a plane crash. One of the firemen took these photos. But they were **SNUBBED** in the **OFFICIAL** story of the day. Instead of heroes, they were ignored uninvited nonentities. Their story only emerged on the internet.

continued next page



PHOTO 0424 7 firemen fire in window, no fire at front of trailer, police car C1 single red light, stick S in front of rail.

PHOTO 0425 6 firemen, little fire in window, big fire at front of trailer, police car C1 single red light, stick S in front of rail is not seen.

PHOTO 0426 9 firemen, no fire in window, little fire at front of trailer, police car C1 single red light, stick S in front of rail. Man appears.




PHOTO 0430 firemen are scattered, small fire in window, police car C1 disappears, stick S BEHIND smooth new rail, man appears.

PHOTO 0431 firemen are scattered, small fire in window, NEW police car C2 APPEARS, stick S barely in photo, and yield traffic sign Y appears.

The white line aligns all photos with window W at top. It is unlikely that these Department of Defense photos are genuine. All are likely to be computer composites.





9:37 a.m. Pentagon explosion
9:47 a.m. Firetrucks arrive

Wall collapsed at 10:10 a.m., above. Firetrucks arrived about 9:47 a.m., at right, and put out minor fires within 7 minutes (9:54). Thus any photos (right) which show wall still standing (lightened areas) and fires out must be taken within a 16-minute period, a very tight time frame for photos to be made by Pentagon photographers.



COMPARE THE SHADOWS

Was the west side of the Pentagon in full shade in the morning sun (upper right) or in full sun (lower 3 photos)? In the 16-minute time span between arrival of firetrucks and wall collapse, it cannot be both.

Mystery cars revisited



As we have seen, the official photo record shows two cars destroyed at the Pentagon fire...a green Jeep (B) and a white Nissan (A), both of which **CHANGED COLORS** after the fire. So I was surprised when in 2005 I came across the photo below, which seems to show a third car, burned and battered, with a large beam through the windshield. What demolished this "new mystery car," and where was it when the other photos were taken?




continued next page




Throughout the 3 days that the Pentagon fires were kept burning, the photography props kept changing. Perhaps the best examples are the 2 mystery cars. One of them was a GREEN Jeep Cherokee like the gray one at left. It simply could not hold a pose. At various times it appeared in different locations and different configurations, till it was finally totally demolished (below) in two different poses, with the top ripped off. In the first location, a beam is through the windshield; in the second location, the beam is across the hood.



In its first pose, the Jeep is green and not burning. Other photos show it burning and not burning, but changing color to white. It then (below) is moved to a location a few feet to the north, but still intact. The final move in the shell game is total destruction.



Why was the Jeep Cherokee moved 4 times and then almost smashed beyond recognition?





continued next page




The trailer that burned, and burned and burned and...

According to records of 9-11, the Pentagon fire continued to smoke and smoulder for about 72 hours. This is inconceivable in the era of modern firefighting. The most prominent fire was not the Pentagon building itself, but a construction trailer outside. At top two firetrucks from National Airport arrived within 10 minutes (left) and found a few small fires, including the trailer. In their report they say ALL fires were put out within 7 or 8 minutes, as their photo shows. Yet "before" the firemen arrived "someone" caught the actual "explosion" of the plane and the trailer afire (photo 2). How prescient of some photographer to be available when the "plane" hit! Nevertheless, as the 2 bottom photos show, the foam from the 2 firetrucks quickly extinguished the burning trailer fire. As we will see, that was not the end of the trailer fire, however.



According to the official story, the incoming 757 (wingspan 125 feet) knocked down a section of chain-link fence (A in all above photos). Yet the jet failed to hit the trailer next to the fence! The exploding jet left no debris! Impossible!

continued next page



Two views of the chain-link fence "knocked down" by the giant 757 jet raise more questions than they answer. Note the "knocked down" posts and fencing, the burned "stair" to nowhere, and at bottom, the additional trailer (T) on fire!



continued next page




Described in press reports as having "burned out of control" for about 72 hours, the Pentagon fire was most strange. Two firetrucks from National Airport put out all fires within seven minutes, including the trailer, seen still smouldering at the top. Then the trucks left the sunlit scene. Much later at bottom...note additional white building destroyed (A) in different lighting...the trucks return to spray water on an already extinguished area, while ignoring a new fire coming out of upper Pentagon windows (B). Note the total absence of people in both photographs! Neither photo makes sense. Both are obviously "posed!"

continued next page

BEFORE LATER COLLAPSE



COLLAPSE
10:10 a.m.
TRUCK IN FULL SUN




I have previously shown that the top photo is likely a composite of various poses previous to 10:10 a.m. before the wall collapse. Note firemen just standing around; no firefighting activity, despite some fires. The green Jeep has been sprayed with foam. Note shadow of building before collapse. After collapse, the area is suddenly in full sun, the firetruck is gone and the Jeep **BURSTS INTO FLAMES**, as people pose in foreground. Discontinuity in poses proves photo fakery!


STRANGE POSES

continued next page

...but make sure no people are in the pose




There are dozens of strange photos such as this, with no people. Fires are burning, but no firemen spraying water. Firetrucks are present, but not in use. Time or date of many of these pictures are unknown. Following are many such photographs which seem entirely artificial poses.



...but make sure no people are in the pose

**The
Pentagon
burns,
the trailer
smokes,
but not
a firetruck
not
fireman is
available
in these
odd poses.**

Little wonder that
the fire burned for
three days with
firefighting efforts
such as seen in
these photos.





**Strange poses:
No firemen, but
trucks squirt puffy
water streams on
extinguished area.**

I believe that the fires were kept burning for three days so that photographs like these could be taken. Based on sunlight, these poses are much later than the morning of 9-11...perhaps even the next day!

continued next page

Hold that pose...please!



**Let's get
poses
with and
without
firetrucks...**



**...but no
people,
please!**

People might wonder why they are asked to pose the next day!



The devil is in the detail


A camera apparently was set up at the Naval Annex on a nearby hill to record 911 events from the same viewpoint...poses with **NO FIRETRUCKS** and **NO PEOPLE**. But as time passed, they could not hold the same pose! Small details change between the top and bottom pictures. The lighting changes, the burning trailer gets bigger, a lightpole disappears, a cable spool appears, the Jeep SUV catches fire, but other things do not change.



Note the **GREEN** tree (box) which in other photos is totally burned.



continued next page



**Just
can't
hold
a
pose
very
long !**



As noted on an earlier page, these photos are probably the most egregious example of changed poses from the Pentagon event. Not only has the green Jeep SUV changed to white between the first pose and the second, the entire background is entirely different, and the car is seen at a totally different size and location compared to the background. Note the bottom photo is after the wall has been shored up. Again, people are not present.

Note that when the Jeep is the same size and viewpoint, the backgrounds are entirely out of synch.

continued next page



Point A
matched
to Point A
**background
match**



Point B
matched
to Point B
**foreground
match**


Sometimes study results are very difficult to understand.

When I noticed that photos 1 and 2 from nearly the same viewpoint had the same reference points (A and B), I began a study which lasted many weeks without very much success. By matching A to A, I found that the top portions of each image matched perfectly, and matching B to B, the bottoms of the images matched. But the cement post (green dot) can never match the piece of metal (B) as shown by the green line. I don't think this is a matter of perspective, and if not, I cannot understand what it means, since A and B are very close together. Inconclusive result, I suppose. Also, notice the five unidentifiable "posing" firemen in T-shirts spraying water long after the fires were extinguished.

continued next page



Was 9-11 a FIREMEN'S HOLIDAY ?



Many photos such as above show unmanned firetrucks spewing thin water streams at the building, with no fires seen. Though obviously in the afternoon, the wall of the building is almost black instead of in sun. Left, two fire vehicles are by the heliport, but no firemen. All fires are out, but at top the Jeep is white, but at the bottom is still green. Where are all the firemen?

continued next page



From beginning to end, very few photos show heroic firemen putting out fires!




There are many photos of "fire equipment" (left) spraying water or foam...but almost no identifiable photos of firemen at work. There are many distant shots of "firemen" just standing around or doing something trivial. It is almost as if NO FIREMEN were present, except the UNINVITED group on the two trucks from National Airport who were first on the scene and took their own photos.

continued next page



Arriving much later than other fire equipment, an extension ladder truck was used to douse flames coming from a window above the heliport. Out of hundreds of photos, the photo above is the only one I could find that actually showed a fireman doing something!




Sequence of fires very puzzling

The fire at left (B) was not burning (above) after all fires were out and the trucks departed. But then it breaks out and the extension ladder is used to put it out. Trailer fire was extinguished, then flared up again. Burning cars were put out and reignited. Why?

continued next page

Then there were poses of unidentified firemen just standing around



Fire? What fire? I could find NO photos of identifiable firemen fighting any fire. Were these merely actors called in to POSE as firemen at a later time?

continued next page



Hey, fellas...the building is on fire! Do something!



Picture after picture shows unidentifiable firemen standing around doing nothing. Is this any way to fight a fire involving a major airliner crash into a big office building, with thousands of gallons of jet fuel burning out of control so hot that all traces of the airplane disappeared? What is going on here?



continued next page



From too few people to too many!



Apparently somebody decided more activity was needed in the photos. Long after the trailer fire was out, people and props were added to the pose, and the trailer reignited, above. Left, after the red firetruck was moved, a cast of hundreds was brought in and green jugs added. Bottom, five Green Berets run across the lawn on cue, after a piece of aircraft wreckage had been planted there. These photos obviously staged later!



continued next page

Planting evidence

The first firemen on the scene found an undamaged lawn with no plane crash debris anywhere, and NO SIGNS OF A PLANE CRASH, but...

...later pictures show debris everywhere!



Suspicious pieces of "wreckage" were later photographed. They showed no signs of charring or explosion, nor did they disturb the ground where they lie. The government failed to produce any part numbers that are on every part of any aircraft, which would prove beyond any doubt that AA77 crashed into the Pentagon. Thus we must conclude the parts were planted.

continued next page





The most famous piece of debris.



The above detail from each photo seems to show an identical point of view from camera to debris, but full photos show viewpoints to be different directions.


The DoD produced these photos to show a "piece of fuselage" from AA77. Intense study of these images leads me to consider the likelihood that this artifact was inserted into photographs using computer PhotoShop. It shows no sign of fire or explosion, and did not disturb grass where it fell.

[continued next page](#)



With camera pointing 4 different directions, "AAT7 debris" looks about the same.

After completing my studies of the alleged mystery piece of debris, I found several other photos which apparently show the "same" object. Unfortunately, it is very small in these photos so nothing definitive may be concluded, but it appears that even when the view is from four different directions, the thing looks about the same. It is probable that it was inserted by PhotoShop®



continued next page



Although the first firemen on the scene said they saw no aircraft wreckage, many posed photos show personnel collecting (?) uncharred chunks of jetliner (?) where they fell without damage to grass. One piece was so large and so secret it had to be covered with a blue tarp. A retired FAA accident investigator said:


"Following cool-down of the resulting fire, this crash site would have been very easy to collect enough serial numbered parts within 15 minutes to positively identify the aircraft registry."

Unlike any other US aircraft crash in history, no "time-change" part numbers were given to the FAA for 911 crashes. Why are they secret?

continued next page



Rescue team leads "victim" to aircraft part.



We have already shown, left, that any photo which shows the red firetruck parked by window 12 is fake. So the photo above, which shows a "rescue team" about to step on an "aircraft part" is already fake. But the caption with it was also fake, as it described the photo as a "victim" being removed from the Pentagon. Examination of the picture shows a fireman with towel over face on the gurney, with man at left carrying his coat and one boot.



Frequent checking of the internet finds new photos being posted. I just found this one that was unfamiliar to me. Snapped at 8:43 p.m. (what day?) before the building was shored up, we see heavy equipment moving photo props to new locations! The red firetruck has been moved south in front of the door, and the car has been moved north on the other side of the truck. The Jeep has been move north also, but not as far as the car, but the **SPACING BETWEEN THE CAR AND JEEP HAS BEEN CAREFULLY MAINTAINED!** If the moving equipment was merely cleaning up debris in the area, why were the truck, car and Jeep so carefully placed? Why so many locations for these props? Does this photo give away a "secret"?

continued next page

Real aircraft part, wrong airplane!

Workers cleaning out the interior of the building a few days later found what was identified as an engine part of the hijacked Boeing 757. Refusing to accept the official identification, researchers determined many problems with this part being from AA Flight 77...see next page.






Diameter of a turbojet engine of a 757 exceeds 8 feet, far too large for the small rotor part found at the Pentagon, even though its blades are missing. A much closer match is the photo below.



mystery engine part

Steve Patterson, 43, said, "he saw a silver commuter jet fly past the window of his 14th-floor apartment in Pentagon City. He said the plane, which sounded like the high-pitched squeal of a fighter jet, was flying so fast that he couldn't read any writing on the side. The plane, which appeared to hold about eight to 12 people, headed straight for the Pentagon."



The engine nacelle above has a diameter of around 40 inches. The Boeing 757 at left has nacelles of about 98 inches diameter, more than twice as big. Notice the row of windows, which could give the impression to a witness that the plane is small commuter jet holding 8 to 12 people. In silver with red/blue markings and a wingspan of about 73 feet, it would look like a small AA jet.

After studying all the possibilities, I believe the plane shown in the Pentagon surveillance video is a Navy



A-3
Sky
Warrior



... not a
Boeing 757

The Internet has numerous websites about the surveillance video and the mystery engine part. After evaluating them all, I found that the one I most agreed with was by Jon Carlson (carlson.jon@att.net) found at Renee.com, who said, in part:

"Chicago's Museum of Science and Industry displays the Pratt & Whitney JT8D. These photos show that JT8D matches the Pentagon engine photographed at the crash site. Note the outlined bolt flanges for comparison purposes. The bolt flanges hold the sections of the engine together. Both engines have portions of the outer cover removed so the inner engine is clearly visible.

Measurements:

Fan tip diameter: 39.9 - 49.2 in

Length, flange to flange: 120.0 - 154.1 in

From: <http://www.pratt-whitney.com/prod>



Mystery part
is located
HERE

They are all jet engine components (past and present) on the A-3 Skywarrior twin-turbojet airplane and on older versions of the 737. The USAF only has a few of the A-3s left in operation and what was formerly Hughes Aircraft, now Raytheon, has a fleet of them at Van Nuys, Calif. This type of turbojet engine has never been used on a Boeing 757, so the debate on "type of plane" can end there. "

continued next page




Judging by the pilot above, giant size of the A-3 is apparent. You can see that the A-3 is 60 percent of the size of a 757, and with passenger windows under the wings it could easily pass as a commuter jet with an appropriate paint job and logo. It came in many configurations, including folding wings for aircraft carrier use. Maximum passenger capacity was 12 with crew of three. It could be fitted with various armaments, including MISSILES and nuclear bombs. After the A-3 was retired, the fleet was purchased by defense contractor Raytheon. Like other military planes, it could be fitted with remote control technology. I believe an A-3, painted to resemble an AA jet, was flown by remote control, and remotely fired high-explosive bunker-buster missile to open the Pentagon wall just before it crashed.



In aircraft carrier use.

covert paint job?



witness psychology

I am not a psychologist, so I can only speak for myself. If a jet plane flew past me at over 300 mph at less than 100 feet altitude and then crashed, my layman glimpse would be based on such quick clues as insignias, paint colors, number of engines, windows and noise...not the plane model. I could not identify a 757. Regardless of plane type, a large silver jet with the AA logo on the tail and a red-white-blue stripe to me would be an American Airlines passenger plane.

continued next page




NEW YORK

Bizarre coincidence ?



WASHINGTON


On Manhattan's Murray Street on 9-11 was found the "jet engine" from a 757 or 767, above. It was very small compared to the wastebasket seen in the street beside it. A quite similar "jet engine" was swept out at the Pentagon. Is this just a bizarre coincidence? Such parts can be positively identified by their RPNs (replacement part serial numbers). Why have they not been ID'ed? At right is what a giant jet engine REALLY looks like when it blasts a crater in the ground.



continued next page



It is clear as A-B-C that photo 2 was a computer illustration, as I have previously shown. Photo number 1 was shot while the Jeep was still green. Photo 2 shows the Jeep white, so it is later. Photo 1 shows object A to be an open metal framework. Photo 2 shows object A to have SOLID "shelves". Since it had no solid shelves in 1, it cannot have them in 2. Note at right that computer enhancement of contrast and chroma scales makes the changes very clear. Note that in 2, A is much higher than Jeep. I previously showed that photo 2 is from a viewpoint that is impossibly high.



it depends on how you look at it


It has already been demonstrated that the photo of a fireman between two guardrails at right is faked because of the impossibly high viewpoint and that it is probably a computerized composite.



The recently discovered photo at left shows a more reasonable perspective, looking toward the first floor instead of the second. Both photos look eastward. But compared to a photo looking southward, objects B and C appear the same as the eastward view! This is not possible. Also, in the red box between the man's legs is a botched gray shape which is neither guardrail nor grass. Also, with the man at the same scale, the width of the steel rail differs greatly (below).



At right, notice that when the fireman is scaled to the same size, the guardrail is nearly twice as wide (red line).



Few things about the 911 Pentagon event are more puzzling than the alleged hitting of 5 lightpoles by a giant 757 jetliner flying less than 20 feet above ground at high speed. At left is an aerial view of the scene as the "Boeing jetliner" with a wingspan of 125 feet approached the west side of the Pentagon, allegedly impacting the west wall at the orange spot. A very large number of witnesses claimed to see a large plane hit lightpoles. Photos of the downed poles exist. But despite this official story, many questions have no satisfactory answers.

For a discussion of lift and ground effect lift in particular go to <http://www.su.washington.edu/faculty/eberhard/lift.htm> where I obtained the illustration below. If I understand the principle correctly when the angle of attack is reduced (more level and nose down) and speed is high, the upwash force is too great for the aircraft to approach the ground, and aerodynamics do not allow it to go lower. This is why landing airplanes SLOW down and approach nose UP, otherwise they could not land.


Question one:

What about ground effect lift?

Several 911 websites have statements by pilots that the Pentagon event is impossible because of ground effect lift...that is, flying level at more than 300 knots and ONLY 20 FEET FROM THE GROUND IS IMPOSSIBLE for a giant plane like a 757. They say that aerodynamic forces would cause the plane to rise, not go lower. If true, how could the huge plane clip the 30' (approximated) lightpoles?



continued next page



From ASSOCIATED PRESS:

Ex-President Bush Was to Board Downed Jet

Monday, November 22, 2004

HOUSTON — A private jet that was en route to Houston to pick up former President Bush clipped a light pole and crashed Monday as it approached Hobby Airport in thick fog, killing all three people aboard.

The Gulfstream G-1159A jet, coming into Houston, went down about 8:15 a.m. in an undeveloped area 1 1/2 miles south of the airport, officials said.

The jet en route from Love Field in Dallas, was approaching the runway when it clipped the light pole, losing part of a wing, authorities said. Wreckage extended about 100 yards from there, Williams said.

The crash site is a field near the Bellway Boulevard. No one on the ground was injured, but one car was hit with debris while another was hit with jet fuel, Williams said.

Question two:

What happens when a twin-engine jet hits a light pole?



"It clipped the light pole, losing part of a wing."

The pole bent, but stayed in place (left) after the two-engine jet hit it and crashed. Why didn't FIVE light poles in Washington rip the jet's wings off, when in Houston, it took just one?

continued next page




OFFICIAL SCENARIO:

American Airlines Flight 77, flying at over 300 mph, came in at altitude less than 20 feet, striking five aluminum lightpoles (upper right) which are about 30 feet tall, avoiding three much taller structures. The aluminum 757 wings survived the impact intact. The lightpoles simply fell over.


What's wrong with the above scenario? It seems to violate well known laws of physics. Newton's Third Law of Motion states that "For every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction". Thus the poles should have either (a) ripped the plane's wings off, or (b) the poles should have been propelled to the east at 300+ mph. Instead (lower left), four poles simply fell gently forward largely undamaged, or in one case, pole 2 actually fell the opposite direction from the impact!

**Question three:
What about the laws of physics?**



Where the poles fell, left

continued next page



Question four:

**Do downed poles
show the path?**



Assuming the poles indicate the path of the 125' wingspan of a 757, then poles 1&3 were hit by the right wingtip, since the 60' tall VDOT video pole was not hit (green square). If this is true, the impact (orange dot) on the west wall of the Pentagon was nearly 100' too far south, according to photos. At bottom, the Naval Annex Building, a five-story building on a tall hill, was in the path of the plane (yellow line below). If the plane was only 20 feet off the ground, its left wingtip should have hit the wall of the annex building at about the third floor level. Those Arabs were great pilots!



continued next page



- POLE HIT
- POLE NOT HIT
- VERY TALL VIDEO POLE NOT HIT
- VERY TALL OVERHEAD HIGHWAY SIGN NOT HIT



LOCATION
OF POLE 1
BEHIND
GUARDRAIL

Question 5:
Can pole
number
one be
explained?



Pole number one was the most "photographed" of the fallen poles. In my opinion, there are many things wrong with the photos; some were probably staged, some were probably PhotoShopped. Pole number one will be examined in detail on the next page.

continued next page



A = CAB
B = AUTO
C = 2 POLES
D = 1 POLE



Computer assembly!



Photo 1 at left is an indisputable case of computer graphics assembly of two photos. Clearly parts of photo 2 have been inserted into photo 1. The taxicab (A) is an identical view, left. The auto (B) is an identical view. The tall pole (D) is in the same location, above the rear fender. But **MISSING** are the two poles (C) over the top of the cab. Instead, the computer artist inserted a blazing trailer inferno which never existed where the poles should be, since the trailer fire was extinguished within seven minutes. PhotoShoppery at work!

continued next page

pole one continued



Check the damage

This Lincoln Continental Capitol Cab was hit by a light pole knocked down by a 757 flying 20' feet overhead at 300+ mph. It had a hole knocked in the windshield. "Luckily" that was the ONLY damage; not a scratch anywhere else, not even broken glass shards or a speck of dust. Or was that how it happened?

The case of the broken glass.

continued next page



Above is the most widely reproduced photo of downed pole number one. Careful scrutiny reveals several seeming anomalies. Aerial pictures show that a light pole was about 20 feet beyond each end of the stone bridge, just behind the steel guardrail. We see a virtually undamaged pole number one, with a slight bend, and no scratches or signs of impact, but with the lamp arm missing. It is in the first lane, just a few feet from where it stood. At the other end of the bridge stands what seems to be POLE NUMBER TWO, which also was allegedly knocked down by the jetliner!

Was this a staged photo event?

continued next page




Where was the Capitol Cab when pole one fell?

The Department of Defense released a series of photos apparently taken from the nearby Naval Annex soon after the explosion.


Unfortunately, none of them shows a clear view of the cab and downed pole; they are hidden by a bush.

Early in the sequence the white car is seen (top), apparently preceded by a small red car. The cab cannot be seen. Later photos show the open cab door, which could have been added by PhotoShop.



This study is by no means conclusive. Considerable time has passed between first and second photos (note traffic). Since the cab is "hidden" in the top photo, it is impossible to say it is not there, or whether the photos are staged or altered by computer. Was the cab there?

continued next page



To aid understanding, above is the alleged path of AA77 established BY THE DOWNED POLE. If pole one was knocked over at A and struck the Pentagon at B, a flight path is affirmed, as seen in the satellite view above, showing that the plane, flying lower than 30' over the surface barely missed hitting the five-story Naval Annex, which is situated on a tall hill.

Motorist Penny Elgas was driving north on IH395, above. She said she saw the plane clip the top of pole one. She said the aircraft part above fell through the sunroof of her car. Problems with this? The part appears to be a graphite composite material used in military aircraft, and it is painted WHITE. Wings of AA77 were silvery aluminum.



- POLE HIT
- POLE NOT HIT
- VERY TALL VIDEO POLE NOT HIT
- VERY TALL OVERHEAD HIGHWAY SIGN NOT HIT




Only two known photos exist of "pole 2" where it fell, and they are mutually exclusive (both cannot be true). Above, the bent pole points to the heliport. Below, it points to the part of the building which collapsed (X), 90 degrees away! Also, the standing light pole nearby has the top turned wrong by 180 degrees!

**Question 6:
Why did
pole two
fall
backwards?**



If pole 2 fell backward as shown when hit by a 757 at 300+ knots, it violates Newton's Law of Inertia. It should have gone east, not west!

continued next page



- POLE HIT
- POLE NOT HIT
- VERY TALL VIDEO POLE NOT HIT
- VERY TALL OVERHEAD HIGHWAY SIGN NOT HIT




Question seven:
Why did pole three just fall over?



The only available photo of pole 3 where it fell shows that it fell over only a few feet from its location beside the cloverleaf ramp. Oddly the tubular aluminum pole (A) shows virtually NO damage, having just fallen over about ten feet from the curb. It was jerked loose from the four bolts which held it to its aluminum base (B), and the base came loose from its concrete foundation...but none of the wires are seen. The lamp and lamp arm lie just a foot away. Why did pole 3 just fall over?

continued next page



- POLE HIT
- POLE NOT HIT
- VERY TALL VIDEO POLE NOT HIT
- VERY TALL OVERHEAD HIGHWAY SIGN NOT HIT





Question eight:
How did pole four and others fall down so gently?



Pole four, two photos above, fell so gently to the ground that it did not disturb the grass. The base was not broken, and was still attached to the pole. The wiring was still attached to the base. The pole is hardly bent or deformed, but its top is neatly cut off. The official story says that a Boeing 757 with a weight of nearly 250,000 pounds flying in excess of 300 knots clipped the tops off of five light poles like a knife cutting butter, but the poles themselves gently toppled over about six feet from their foundations without even disturbing the ground where they landed. Does this seem reasonable?

continued next page




**Question
nine:
Was
pole five
a prop
placed in
position?**



Strange as it may seem, the two photos above allegedly represent the same scene. Pole 5, ripped from its foundation with its base still intact, was sliced into two pieces by the 757 wing, tossed into the air, and landed gently on the ground in the shape of a cross without disturbing the grass, with a mangled end resting on the sidewalk and the base just a few feet from the guardrail. Is this what really happened?


continued next page

The mystery of the Murray Street sign on the sidewalk



In the official scenario, an aircraft "engine" sailed four blocks through the air from the WTC second aircraft impact, hit a small street sign saying MURRAY STREET attached to a corner light pole. The sign and pole were so sturdy that they stopped the flight of the object, and it dropped straight down to the sidewalk; the street sign, at the second story level, fell to the sidewalk right beside the aircraft part, where it was photographed by the FBI on 9-11. But there is a problem with this scenario...it fails to account for the scaffolding which covered the entire corner with multiple scaffold poles and overhead planking. Somehow both the street sign and "engine" managed to fall down INSIDE AND UNDER the scaffolding, a seeming impossibility. Just as the flimsy sign could not stop the momentum of the engine. In the 9-11 photo at left, A is the Murray Street sign, B is the "engine", C is the pole to which the sign had been attached, and D is the scaffolding which surrounded the sidewalk on sides and top. A 2008 Google photo shows the same corner now. The Murray Street sign is attached to pole C at the second floor level. A trash basket about the same size as the "engine" sits in the same spot of the 9-11 photo. Looking at both photos, one must wonder how the flying "engine" could hit the sign and fall directly to the sidewalk, avoiding the scaffolding.

pole five continued




The photo above is DoD number a13-DSC_0424-1 which I have stated in an earlier chapter that I consider to be a computer assemblage for several reasons. Behind the police car, it allegedly shows pole 5 (compare with photo at bottom of page).




The listing at right is at a DoD website. Every photo on the list I consider to be either staged or manipulated by computer, including all shown here.

#02-DSC 0412-1	#16-DSC 0428-1
#03-DSC 0413-1	#17-DSC 0429-1
#04-DSC 0415-1	#18-DSC 0430-1
#06-DSC 0417-1	#19-DSC 0431-1
#07-DSC 0418-1	#20-DSC 0433-1
#08-DSC 0419-1	#21-DSC 0434-1
#09-DSC 0420-1	#22-DSC 0435-1
#10-DSC 0421-1	#23-DSC 0438-1
#10a-DSC 0472-1	#24-DSC 0444-1
#11-DSC 0422-1	#26-DSC 0446-1
#13-DSC 0424-1	#27-DSC 0447-1
#14-DSC 0425-1	#28-DSC 0451-1
#15-DSC 0426-1	#30-DSC 0478-1




On an earlier page I said that the pole seen to the rear of the police car as well as the pole at right had been put in by computer graphics. Both the car and the pole are placed much too high when you compare with view at bottom.



Summary:

The official story says that a Boeing 757 weighing 250,000 pounds and flying lower than 30 feet from the surface at more than 300 knots, flown by hijackers who had never flown such a plane, just before crashing into the first and second floors of the Pentagon struck the tops of five light poles with the plane wings, knocking down the poles as seen in photos at right. Numerous witnesses described a plane hitting one or more light poles, so "something" must have happened. But based on the photo record, it is hard to verify the official story. Three of the poles are virtually undamaged, missing only the top lamp arms. One pole was severed in two parts a little over half way up. One pole was bent at a right angle near the top and fell opposite the expected direction. All poles fell within a few feet of their bases, doing no damage to the ground where they hit. Experts say that according to the laws of physics, the poles did not behave as would be expected by being propelled eastward at 300+ knots, but instead fell gently to the ground and suffered little damage. Study of the photos leads me to believe that some of the poles may have been planted props and some may have been computer generated. If witnesses are to be believed, at least one pole may have been hit. If ANY of the photos have been manipulated in any way, one must conclude that the official story is false in some respects, and the puzzle of the poles remains a mystery.





Above are two versions of the same photo. The lower one is a cropped computer enhancement. This photo is a considerable mystery. I have been unable to establish a provenance for it. It is clearly of an "explosion" before any firemen arrived, so it is within the first 10 minutes. It is difficult to imagine someone with the prescience to be waiting with a camera to take this photo, and then be anonymous. No aircraft wreckage is seen...but this "explosion" has managed to start a conflagration of the trailer, right, and the Nissan car at far left. Large construction spools are undamaged. My suspicion is that this photo is a "special effect". On the following pages I will attempt to document the trailer fire, which allegedly burned for 72 hours.

continued next page



The digital photos of Steve Riskus are the earliest known images at the Pentagon.


Motorist Steve Riskus was driving south on the freeway on the west side of the Pentagon.

Suddenly a big plane roared overhead in front of his car and struck the Pentagon. Though shocked by the event he witnessed, he had his digital camera with him and snapped a series of photos. The one at top was within the first minute. It shows no explosion and almost no fire. The tiny flames at right in both photos are the burning trailer. These are the first known images of the trailer fire. Riskus immediately put his photos on his internet site for all to view. I have many reasons to think that the Riskus photos are genuine and that he is a sincere witness.



continued next page

trailer, trailer, burning bright



Riskus shows what the firemen saw on arrival

Two firetrucks from National Airport arrived within 10 minutes. Riskus shows minor fires in the Pentagon and a blaze on the BACKSIDE of the trailer that firemen put out quickly. What's burning is not clear, nor how it caught fire so distant from the impact point, which is behind the foreground pole in the bottom photo.

continued next page



Riskus shows trailer not set afire, but damaged

The detail above from the Riskus photo below shows the TRAILER NOT ON FIRE, but its front end apparently EXPLODED. The fire is coming out of the top of the low dark object east of the front of the trailer which appears to be a "dumpster" refuse container. Note the white pickup beyond the trailer, which is seen for the first and only time. Note the chainlink fence and two posts blown outward by the force of the explosion that destroyed the front of the trailer (detail below). Some researchers have argued that a bomb in the trailer exploded. The above image makes that case.



In the photo above, note the two posts from the chainlink fence bent outward away from the trailer. The official story says a 757 engine nacelle tore the fence down. But how did it hit these two posts and not the three at left...and why would the posts fall west instead of east?

continued next page




Stairway to nowhere!

LANDING IS BURNED AWAY, TRAILER DOOR IS BLOWN AWAY!

The photo at top and many others show a wooden temporary stairway to a DOOR on the side of the trailer being used as a construction office. Clearly the landing at the top of the steps has burned away. There IS NO DOOR because the front third of the trailer has been blown away by an explosion! Behind the trailer is what looks like a dumpster refuse container, with blazes coming from inside it. If the front third of the trailer is missing, this cannot be attributed to a plane crashing.

continued next page



When firemen arrived ...

**only something inside of
a dumpster container
was burning!**

When fire crews arrived within the first 10 minutes, the biggest fire confronting them was something burning with black smoke **INSIDE A DUMPSTER!** They extinguished it in seven minutes. Why, then, did the trailer continue to burn in later photos?

continued next page

The man in the construction trailer

DiPaula, Michael

Michael DiPaula 41, project coordinator Pentagon Renovation Team - He left a meeting in the Pentagon just minutes before the crash, looking for an electrician who didn't show, in a construction trailer less than 75 feet away. "Suddenly, an airplane roared into view, nearly shearing the roof off the trailer before slamming into the E ring. 'It sounded like a missile,' DiPaula recalls . . . Buried in debris and covered with airplane fuel, he was briefly listed by authorities as missing, but eventually crawled from the flaming debris and the shroud of black smoke unscathed. (from Killtown witness list)



The Riskus photo above shows the "construction trailer" IMMEDIATELY after the Pentagon explosion. It shows the FRONT OF THE TRAILER either missing altogether, exposing a "dumpster" beyond with flaming contents OR the complete trailer with the top half of the front third missing. Early press reports quoting DiPaula indicate he was INSIDE the trailer. Indeed, Riskus and other photos show wooden stairs that go up to an unseen door at the top of the landing. There are several problems raised by the Riskus photo and the DiPaula statements which I will discuss on the next page.

[continued next page](#)